

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, claims 3-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,089,817 to *Kirkendall*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that the features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by the references of record. New dependent claim 9 is added for an alternative scope of protection. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending for further consideration.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kirkendall*. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following comments.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established that *Kirkendall* anticipates each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention and that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn. Namely, Applicants contend that independent claim 1 recites the features of "a conductive screw projection, electrically connected with the antenna element and inserted into a hole formed in the vehicle body," and "a second insulative member, disposed inside the vehicle body to electrically insulate the screw projection from the washer, and to electrically insulate the nut from the washer." At least these features are not disclosed or taught by *Kirkendall*.

Kirkendall discloses an on-the-glass type antenna. The application is said to improve upon the conventional antenna installation which “normally requires the formation of apertures in or other defacement of the vehicle to which it mounts and/or the application of special fasteners.” See col. 1, lines 9-18 of *Kirkendall*.

Kirkendall does not disclose “a conductive screw projection [that is] inserted into a hole formed in the vehicle body.” In fact, *Kirkendall* actually discloses the opposite *i.e.*, an installation without a hole being formed in the vehicle body. *Kirkendall* does not teach or suggest a hole in the vehicle glass for the insertion of a conductive screw projection. Further, *Kirkendall* does not disclose “a second insulative member, disposed inside the vehicle body to electrically insulate the screw projection from the washer, and to electrically insulate the nut from the washer.” It appears from Fig. 7 of *Kirkendall* that the conductive screw projection (84) has no insulative member between it and the washers (88-90). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kirkendall* fails to teach or suggest at least the above features of claim 1. Because *Kirkendall* does not disclose these features, *Kirkendall* cannot anticipate the invention recited in claim 1.

With regard to the features of dependent claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not specifically identified any of the features recited in the claim as being disclosed in any figure of *Kirkendall*.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Kirkendall* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 2 and 3-8 are also allowable insofar as they recite the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent claim 9 is allowable insofar as it recites the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: August 1, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001